

## **REMARKS**

The above amendments and these remarks are responsive to the Office action dated March 16, 2005. Claims 1, 4, 6, 19, 24, 27, 30, 38, 39 and 42 are amended. Claims 3 and 12 are canceled. Claims 1, 2, 4-11 and 13-43 are pending in the application. The applicant expresses appreciation to the Examiner for the indication of allowability of claims 3-5, 13-18, 20, 21, 24-26, 29-31, 37 and 41-43. In the Office action, the Examiner rejected claims 1, 2, 6, 12, 19, 22 and 38-40 as being anticipated by Mourant et al. and by Kuettner et al., rejected claims 7-11, 23, 27, 28 and 32-36 as being unpatentable over Kuettner et al. in view of Kusunoki, and objected to claims 3-5, 13-18, 20, 21, 24-26, 29-31, 37 and 41-43 as being dependent upon a rejected base claim. In view of the amendments above and the remarks below, the applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the application under 37 C.F.R. § 1.111 and allowance of the pending claims.

### **Rejections under 35 USC § 102**

Claims 1, 2, 6, 12, 19, 22 and 38-40 stand rejected as being anticipated by Mourant et al. and by Kuettner et al. Claim 1 is amended to include the allowable subject matter of claim 3. The applicant submits that claim 1, as amended, clearly distinguishes over both Mourant et al. and Kuettner et al., and is in condition for allowance. The applicant also submits that rejected claims 2, 6, 12, 19 and 22, which depend from claim 1, now are allowable for at least the same reasons that claim 1 is allowable.

Claim 38 is amended to provide additional clarity. On pages 2 and 4 of the Office

action dated March 16, 2005, the Examiner sets forth a rejection of claim 38 in view of Mourant et al. and Kuettner et al. without discussing the elements of claim 38. Claim 38 as amended recites in part, “the first and second conductors forming a first coupled section including an intermediate portion and end portions, with *each of the end portions having a width that is different than a width of the intermediate portion.*” (emphasis added).

The Examiner indicates the allowability of the subject matter in claim 3, which recites a coupler including spirals that “each have an intermediate portion and end portions, with the widths of each of the spirals being different in the intermediate portion than in the end portions.” The aforementioned limitation of claim 38 recites subject matter that is similar to the limitation of claim 3, and is not disclosed in Mourant et al. or Kuettner et al. Accordingly, the applicant submits that claim 38 is allowable. The applicant also submits that rejected claims 39 and 40, which depend from claim 38, are allowable for at least the reasons claim 38 is allowable.

Accordingly, the applicant submits that claims 1, 2, 6, 12, 19, 22 and 38-40 are in condition for allowance. For the foregoing reasons, the applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejections based upon 35 U.S.C. 102.

### **Rejections under 35 USC § 103**

Claims 7-11, 23, 27, 28 and 32-36 stand rejected as being unpatentable over Kuettner et al. in view of Kusunoki. Claims 7-11 and 23 depend from claim 1. The applicant submits that claims 7-11 and 23 are allowable for at least the same reasons claim 1 is allowable as given in the previous discussion of claim 1.

Claim 27 is amended to include generally the allowable subject matter of claim 30, which is not shown or suggested by Kuettner et al. or Kusunoki. The applicant respectfully submits that claim 27 now clearly distinguishes over Kuettner et al. in view of Kusunoki. Therefore, the applicant submits that independent claim 27, as well as claims 28 and 32-36, which depend from claim 27, are allowable for at least the same reasons that claim 27 is allowable.


The applicant submits that claims 7-11, 23, 27, 28 and 32-36 are in condition for allowance. Accordingly, the applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejections based upon 35 U.S.C. 103.

### **CONCLUSION**


The applicant believes that this application is now in condition for allowance, in view of the above amendments and remarks. Accordingly, the applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner issue a Notice of Allowability covering the pending claims. If the Examiner has any questions, or if a telephone interview would in any way advance prosecution of the application, please contact the undersigned attorney of record.

### **CERTIFICATE OF MAILING**

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail, postage prepaid, to: Mail Stop AMENDMENT, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 on June 2, 2005.

  
Tamara Daw

Respectfully submitted,  
KOLISCH HARTWELL, P.C.

  
Edward B. Anderson  
Registration No. 30,154  
Customer No. 23581  
Attorney/Agent for Applicant(s)/Assignee  
520 S.W. Yamhill Street, Suite 200  
Portland, Oregon 97204  
Telephone: (503) 224-6655  
Facsimile: (503) 295-6679